

Remarks

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 22, 23, and 25-30 are at issue. Claims 22, 23 & 25 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by McKendry et al. Claims 1, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKendry in view of Baldwin and further in view of Snelling et al. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKendry in view of Baldwin and further in view of Snelling and further in view of Shen. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKendry in view of Baldwin, in view of Snelling and further in view of Farris. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKendry in view of Baldwin and further in view of Snelling and further in view of Sizer. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKendry in view of Hylton. Claims 27 & 28 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKendry in view of Hylton and further in view of Sizer, II et al. Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKendry in view of Hylton and further in view of Gorman. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sizer in view of McKendry and further in view of Baldwin and further in view of Hylton.

Claim 1 is rejected based on a combination of three references. For the rejection to be valid there must be some suggestion for the combination. Since all three deal with telephony products, the applicants are not contesting that the three references can be combined. However, the applicants believe that a reasonable combination of the three references does not suggest the invention of claim 1. McKendry et al show a personal call manager connected to a pair of POTS lines. Baldwin et al

show a fixed wireless terminal with a caller ID module. The combination of McKendry and Baldwin suggest a personal call manager connected to the fixed wireless terminal. Snelling et al. show a method of wireless linking telephony devices within a residential unit (See FIG. 1) to a network control unit that is connected to standard telephone wires. The combination of McKendry, Baldwin and Snelling suggests that the personal call manager of McKendry be connected to a wireless access unit that links the telephony devices inside a building (Snelling) and has a wireless local loop to the PSTN (Baldwin). This is not the same as the applicants' invention. Claim 1 requires a multiplexer connected to a transceiver that establishes the wireless local loop. The logical combination of the references has the multiplexer for the in-building links.

The applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner has selected the elements from a variety of references but ignored the connections shown in those references. See *Orthopedic Equipment Co., Inc v. US* (CAFC, 1983) 217 USPQ 193, "It is wrong to use a patent [] as [a] guide through maze of prior art references, combining the right references in right way so as to achieve the result of the claims []; Monday morning quarterbacking is improper when resolving nonobviousness." Claim 1 is allowable over the prior art. Claims 2-6 is allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 7 requires a smart card interface. The Examiner cites Hylton et al. as the reference that shows the smart card interface 2155. While the applicants acknowledge that Hylton shows a smart card interface, the smart card interface is part of Digital Entertainment Terminal (DET) for a video on demand system. Logically the DET 100 would be one of the devices connected by a wireless link 410-412 in the house to the personal

call manager of McKendry. This is not part of the home gateway system as required in claim 7. Claim 7 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 8 requires a router. The specification states (page 9, lines 14-15 & page 10, lines 1-3) that the router is used to route data among devices not telephone calls. The switch 50 routes telephone calls (see page 9, lines 24-25). The routing discussed by the Examiner is done by a switch. A router typically refers to routing packets of data and this is clearly the case in the present application. Since no router capable of routing packets of data is shown in the prior art claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 9 & 10 are allowable because Sizer does not show a home automation and security system or television processing system connected to a router. In addition, the router 82 clearly does not have the same function as the switch 50 and the Prior Art only shows switches (for routing calls) not a routing for routing packets. Claims 9 & 10 are allowable.

The Examiner rejects claim 22 by stating that McKendry performs a derived line process. The Examiner is mistaken. "The derived lines procedure steals bandwidth from the other lines to create another line." Page 16, lines 2-4. McKendry never discusses stealing bandwidth from other lines. McKendry uses standard POTS lines which are limited to a single channel or telephone call for each line. No more than a single telephone call can be made over the lines at a time. Claim 22 is clearly allowable over the prior art. Claims 23 & 24 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim.

Claim 25 requires a router. The specification states (page 9, lines 14-15 & page 10, lines 1-3) that the router is used to route data among devices not telephone calls. The switch 50 routes telephone calls (see page 9, lines 24-25). The routing discussed by the Examiner is done by a

switch. A router typically refers to routing packets of data and this is clearly the case in the present application. Since no router capable of routing packets of data is shown in the prior art claim 25 is allowable. Claim 26 is allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim.

Claim 27 & 28 are are allowable because Sizer does not show a home automation and security system or television processing system connected to a router. In addition, the router 82 clearly does not have the same function as the switch 50 and the Prior Art only shows switches (for routing calls) not a router for routing packets. Claims 27 & 28 are allowable. Claim 29 is allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim.

Claim 30 requires a router connected to a switch. None of the prior art references show a router connected to a switch. In addition, none of the prior art references show a home automation and security system capable of receiving messages through a router. Or a television processing system connected to the router. Claim 30 is allowable over the prior art.

